

**REMARKS**

Claims 15-28 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 15 is amended. Support for amended claim 15 can be found at, for example, page 5, line 19 and page 7, lines 23-25. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants greatly appreciate the indication that claims 27 and 28 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 15 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Rotolante (U.S. Patent No. 3,987,298); claims 17, 18 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rotolante; and claims 16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rotolante in view of Gray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,631,460). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

None of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an electromagnetic radiation detection device comprising two superposed detectors, a first non-cooled detector detecting a first range of wavelengths and a second non-cooled detector detecting a second range of wavelengths different from the first range of wavelengths, wherein the first detector is arranged inside a tightly sealed protective housing, at least a top wall of the protective housing comprising the second detector, as recited in independent claim 15.

Rotolante discloses a device wherein detectors A and B detect the same wavelength. The device in Rotolante is designed to determine the wavelength of incident radiation from an unknown line source in a broad spectral range or for distinguishing different blackbody or other broad band radiation sources (column 1, lines 7-13), and not to detect two different ranges of wavelengths from a same incident beam. Detector A is arranged on the insulator 26

above detector B, allowing detector B to receive radiation transmitted by the detector A (column 2, lines 9-14). Detectors A and B are formed of semiconductor materials having essentially the same band gap and the thickness of detector A is less than a thickness of detector B (column 2, lines 20-23, column 2, lines 32 and 33). This allows detectors A and B to respectively produce, with the same detected wavelength, different signals in order to determine the wavelength (column 2, lines 44-51 and column 3, lines 11-19). Therefore, detectors A and B detect the same wavelength. Accordingly, Rotolante does not teach or suggest detecting a second range of wavelengths different from a first range of wavelengths, as recited in independent claim 15.

Further, the Office Action alleges that elements 20, 22, 24 and 26 in Figure 2 of Rotolante form a protective housing unit for detector B. However, Figure 2 clearly shows that electrodes 22 and 24 do not cover the whole surface of lateral walls of detector B. Rotolante merely discloses that electrodes 22 and 24 are attached to opposite ends of detector B (column 2, lines 55 and 56). Nothing in Rotolante indicates that the assembly constituted by insulator 26 and electrodes 22 and 24 cover the whole surface of the top wall of detector B, and nothing in Rotolante teaches that the assembly forms a tightly sealed protective housing encapsulating detector B, as recited in independent claim 15.

Furthermore, Gray also does not teach or suggest at least a first non-cooled detector detecting a first range of wavelengths and a second non-cooled detector detecting a second range of wavelengths different from the first range of wavelengths, wherein the first detector is arranged inside a tightly sealed protective housing, as recited in independent claim 15. Therefore, regardless of other alleged disclosures of Gray, Gray does not remedy the deficiencies of Rotolante described above. Accordingly, any combination of Rotolante and Gray would not have rendered obvious the present claims.

As none of Rotolante and Gray, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every claimed feature, independent claim 15, and its dependent claims, are patentable over the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 15-28 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge  
Registration No. 30,024

Kevin K. Jones  
Registration No. 56,809

WPB:KKJ/can

Date: December 11, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--